

Appl. No. 09/757,289  
Amdt. dated January 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2004

PATENT

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action mailed July 1, 2004, applicants hereby elect with traverse to pursue the invention of Group I, claims 72, 74, 75, 84, 85, and 86. According to the MPEP, where claims can be examined together without undue burden, the Examiner must examine the claims on the merits even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. See, the MPEP at 803.01. In establishing that an "undue burden" would exist for co-examination of claims, the Examiner must show that examination of the claims would involve substantially different prior art searches, making the co-examination burdensome. To show undue burden resulting from searching difficulties, the Examiner must show that the restricted groups have a separate classification, acquired a separate status in the art, or that searching would require different fields of search (MPEP at § 808.02). Applicants respectfully submit that all inventions in the present application can readily be searched without undue burden.

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Bastian  
Reg. No. 34,774

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 415-576-0200  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
KLB:klb/jhd  
60389634 v1